



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,827	10/29/2001	Jason R. Thompson	D5110	5624

7590 08/05/2005

Jeffrey P. Calfa
International Truck Intellectual
Property Company, L.L.C.
4201 Winfield Rd.
Warrenville, IL 60555

EXAMINER

ROSENBERG, LAURA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3616

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

AUG 05 2005

GROUP 3600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/047,827
Filing Date: October 29, 2001
Appellant(s): THOMPSON ET AL.

Jeffrey P. Calfa
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief originally filed 26 March 2004, and the granting of a Petition for Revival of an abandoned application on 17 February 2005. Please note that the Petition Decision mailed on 24 May 2005 states that the Petitioner's Request serves as a Notice of Appeal.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims grouped with claim 1 (claims 1-4, 12-16, 17-21, 29-31, 33-40) and claims grouped with claim 5 (claims 5-11, 22-28) do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

3,395,883	Murgas	8-1968
5,100,093	Rawlinson	3-1992

Applicant's admitted prior art; Figure 3 labeled as Prior Art in this document.

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 01 October 2003.

(11) Response to Argument

The appellant argues that Rawlinson does not teach a "universal accessory-mounted assembly". The examiner contends that Rawlinson's accessory-mounted

Art Unit: 3616

assembly is universal in that it is versatile and could be adapted to meet various requirements, as pointed out when Rawlinson states that the ball from the ball-and-socket assembly "allows the clamps 51 to adapt to all windshields on the market. The ball 50 is necessary because most windshields having compound angles" (Rawlinson: column 5, lines 24-27). Also, though not specifically pointed out, the assembly could be used for various accessory mountings.

The appellant argues that Rawlinson does not teach biaxial movement of the ball-and-socket joint. The examiner contends that the ball-and-socket joint provides a multi-axis pivot, which includes biaxial movement (Rawlinson: column 5, lines 30-32).

The appellant argues that the examiner made a mistake on page 4, the first full paragraph of the final office action. The examiner agrees with the appellant, and apologizes for any confusion. This paragraph should read, "Murgas discloses three support components..."

The appellant argues that the Murgas reference differs from the Rawlinson reference, the admitted prior art, and the appellant's claimed invention in that Murgas's accessory-mounted assembly is intended to be readily removable. However, the appellant does not point out that this feature makes the Murgas reference less applicable as a prior art reference. The examiner contends that this feature of the Murgas reference has no bearing on its use as prior art in the examiner's rejection.

The appellant argues that it is not appropriate to modify the Murgas assembly or the admitted prior art assembly with Rawlinson's ball-and-socket joints because Rawlinson only teaches two support legs, instead of three support legs. The examiner

Art Unit: 3616

contends that Rawlinson teaches the use of ball-and-socket joints for multi-axial movement on surfaces of different shapes and sizes, which can be beneficial to assemblies with various numbers of legs.

The appellant argues that the Murgas reference would be rendered inoperable if modified to include ball-and-socket joints in between the support legs and the feet. The examiner contends that since Murgas's feet (#34, 36) are fixedly engaged on the base structure (#39; best seen in figure 3), the addition of ball-and-socket joints in between the feet and the support legs (#16, 20, 28) would not cause the assembly to be inoperable because the feet would still be able to fixedly engage the base structure, as in the current Murgas reference, and they would not self-detach.

Based on the order of the applicant's arguments, it appears that the applicant may have misunderstood the manner in which the references were applied in the prior art rejection. For clarification, the Murgas patent and the applicant's admitted prior art are both primary references, while the Rawlinson reference is a secondary reference. The teaching from the Rawlinson reference is the use of a ball-and-socket joint to attach a leg, or legs, of an accessory-mounting assembly to a base structure, such as a vehicle. Since the Rawlinson reference is the secondary reference, it is not required to teach all of the features of the claimed invention.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Application/Control Number: 10/047,827
Art Unit: 3616

Page 6

Respectfully submitted,

Laura B. Rosenberg

LBR
July 22, 2005

Conferees
Lesley Morris *LM*
Paul Dickson *PD*
Laura Rosenberg *LBR*

Jeffrey P. Calfa
International Truck Intellectual
Property Company, L.L.C.
4201 Winfield Rd.
Warrenville, IL 60555

Paul N. Dickson 7/25/05
PAUL N. DICKSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Application/Control Number: 10/047,827
Art Unit: 3616

Page 6

Respectfully submitted,

Laura B. Rosenberg

LBR
July 22, 2005

Conferees
Lesley Morris
Paul Dickson
Laura Rosenberg

Jeffrey P. Calfa
International Truck Intellectual
Property Company, L.L.C.
4201 Winfield Rd.
Warrenville, IL 60555